



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,560	07/02/2003	Desiree D.G. Gosby	LOT920030003US1	6618
30449	7590	12/21/2005	EXAMINER	
SCHMEISER, OLSEN + WATTS			BROWN JR, NATHAN II	
3 LEAR JET LANE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 201			PAPER NUMBER	
LATHAM, NY 12110			2121	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/613,560

Applicant(s)

GOSBY, DESIREE D.G.

Examiner

Nathan H. Brown, Jr.

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,10,12,19,30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/2/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This Office is responsive to application 10/613560, filed July 2, 2003.
2. Claims 1-40 have been examined.

## Objections to the Claims

3. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 19, and 30 are objected to because of the following informality:

“closet” should be spelled as -- closest --.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-30, and 32-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *Rosenschein et al.* (USPN 6,519,631 B1).

Regarding claims 1 & 10. *Rosenschein et al.* teach a method and a system for document analysis and retrieval (*see* Abstract), comprising the following steps performed in the order recited:

transmitting, by a remote host in a first computing system to a web service host in a second computing system (*see* Fig. 1, *Examiner interprets server 30 to be a remote host (i.e., remote from the client 52) in a first computing system and servers 90, 92, and 94 to be web service hosts in a second computing system.*), a first portion of a document (*see* col. 8, lines 53-60 and col. 7, lines 65-67, *Examiner interprets the "designated word, or other small quantity of data" to be a first portion of a document and interprets the transaction between server 30 and server 90 to require transmission of the designated word as part of a query to server 90.*);

and sequentially transmitting, by the remote host to the web service host, at least one additional portion of the document (*see* col. 8, line 61 to col. 9 line 10, *Examiner interprets "context-indicating words" to be one additional portion of a document and interprets the transaction between server 30 and server 90 to retrieve one type of information ("stock market") in a "first case" and another type of information ("guns") in a "second case" to require transmission of the context-indicating words as part of a query to server 90 in order to change the context of the query with just the designated word.*), wherein the first portion and the at least one additional portion collectively comprise the entire document (*see* col. 8, lines 53-55, *Examiner asserts that the first and second portions of the displayed data comprise the entire document.*), wherein the entire document is adapted to be reconstructed and subsequently processed via processing said entire document by the web service host, said processing comprising at least one of:

Art Unit: 2121

extracting text from said entire document to configure said text in a text format, if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said text in a non-text format (*see* col. 8, lines 45-52);

determine generating document keys associated with said text from analysis of said text in said text format, if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said text in said text format, or if said web service host has previously performed said extracting such that said text in said text format is available to said web service host (*see* col. 9, lines 59-61);

and determining, from given categories of a document taxonomy, a set of closest (*Examiner assumes -- closest --*) categories to the document based on a comparison between the document keys and category keys of the given categories, if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said document keys, or if said web service host has previously performed said generating such that said document keys are available to said web service host (*see* col. 9, line 16 to col. 10, line 50, *Examiner interprets "concept" to be category.*).

Regarding claims 19 & 30. *Rosenschein et al.* teach a method and a system for document analysis and retrieval (*see* above), comprising the following steps performed in the order recited:

receiving, by a web service host in a second computing system from a remote host in a first computing system, a first portion of a document (*see* above);

Art Unit: 2121

sequentially receiving, by the web service host from the remote host, at least one additional portion of the document, wherein the first portion and the at least one additional portion collectively comprise the entire document (*see above, Examiner asserts that sequential transmitting of the first and second portions of the data implies sequential receiving of the first and second portions of the data.*);

reconstructing the entire document from the first portion and the at least one additional portion (*see col. 9, lines 59-61, Examiner asserts that the array,  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N$ , is capable of reconstructing the entire document where  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N$  consist of every word in the body of the text and that to do this is a design choice.*);

and processing the entire document by the web service host, wherein said processing comprises at least one of:

extracting text from said entire document to configure said text in a text format, if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said text in a non-text format (*see above*);

generating document keys associated with said text from analysis of said text in said text format, if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said text in said text format, or if said web service host has previously performed said extracting such that said text in said text format is available to said web service host (*see above*);

and determining, from given categories of a document taxonomy, a set of closet [sic] categories to the document, if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said

Art Unit: 2121

document keys, or if said web service host has previously performed said generating such that said document keys are available to said web service host (*see above*).

Regarding claims 3 & 12. *Rosenschein et al.* teach the method and system, wherein said transmitting and sequentially transmitting comprise respectively transmitting and sequentially transmitting the first portion and the at least one additional portion via Internet transmission to said web service host (*see col. 8, lines 26-27, Examiner asserts that sequentially transmitting the first portion and the at least one additional portion via Internet transmission is a design choice.*).

Regarding claims 21 & 32. *Rosenschein et al.* teach the method and system, wherein said receiving and sequentially receiving steps comprise receiving the first portion and the at least one additional portion via Internet transmission from said remote host (*see col. 8, lines 26-27, Examiner asserts that sequentially receiving the first portion and the at least one additional portion via Internet transmission is a design choice concomitant with sequentially transmitting the first portion and the at least one additional portion via Internet transmission.*).

Regarding claims 4 & 13 and 22 & 33. *Rosenschein et al.* teach the method and system, wherein said generating comprises: generating tokens of said text such that stop words do not appear in said tokens (*see col. 9, lines 65-67*); and stemming said tokens to generate said document keys from said tokens (*see col. 10, lines 30-37*).

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claims 5 & 14 and 23 & 34. *Rosenschein et al.* teach the method and system, wherein said processing comprises said extracting (*see above*), said generating (*see above*), and said determining (*see above*).

Regarding claims 6 & 15, 7 & 16, 8 & 17, 9 & 18, 24 & 35, 25 & 36, 26 & 37, and 27 & 38.

*Rosenschein et al.* teach the method and system, wherein said processing can comprise some combination of the seven (7) out of eight (8) possible processing combinations, where processing comprises at least one of extracting, generating, and determining (*see col. 12, lines 34-39*).

Regarding claims 28 & 39. *Rosenschein et al.* teach the method and system, wherein said determining comprises:

comparing the category keys of each category (*see col. 9, lines 16-22, Examiner interprets "concept" to be category and  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N$  to be the keys of each category.*) with said document keys (*see col. 9, lines 58-61, Examiner interprets  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N$  to be document keys.*) to make a determination of a distance between the document and each category as a measure of how close the document is to each category (*see col. 10, lines 1-45, Examiner interprets the score  $S(c_j)$  to measure how close a concept (i.e., category) is to the current document.*);

and determining said set of closest categories based on said determination (*see col. 10, lines 47-49, Examiner interprets the set of sorted scores,  $S(c_j)$ , to be the set of categories ordered by closeness.*).



Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claims 29 & 40. *Rosenschein et al.* teach the method and system, wherein said processing comprises said determining, and wherein the method further comprises:

creating a search string, said search string comprising a logical function of a subset of said document keys (*see col. 5, lines 16-18*);

submitting said search string to a search engine (*see above*);

receiving links to related documents from said search engine, said links being based on said search string (*see col. 5, lines 24-25, Examiner interprets "computer data relating to the at least one transmitted word" to comprise links.*);

and returning said links to said remote host (*see above*).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2, 11, 20, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rosenschein et al.* in view of *Mahmoud*, “Registration and Discovery of Web Services Using JAXR with XML Registries such as UDDI and ebXML”, June 2002.

Regarding claims 2 & 11 and 20 & 31. *Rosenschein et al.* teach a method and a system for document analysis and retrieval, as set forth above. *Rosenschein et al.* do not teach a method for document analysis and retrieval, further comprising identifying said web services host, by: executing a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) search to identify one or more web services hosts who can receive said document in chunks and who can perform said at least one of said extracting, generating, and stemming; and selecting said web services host from said one or more web services hosts, prior to the sending step. However, *Mahmoud* does teach a executing a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) search (*see* §The JAXR Programming Model, Example 2: Performing a query). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to persons having ordinary skill in the art to combine *Rosenschein et al.* with *Mahmoud* for the purpose of access to a web service host for handling either document analysis or retrieval.

## Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan H. Brown, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272- 8632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 0830-1700. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571-272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Anthony Knight  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Tech Center 2100

Nathan H. Brown, Jr.  
December 16, 2005